DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 390 516 JC 960 101

AUTHOR Belcher, Marcia J.
TITLE Implementing Teaching/Learning Project Recommendations To Improve First Year Experiences of New Faculty. Research Report No. 95-05R.
INSTITUTION Miami-Dade Community Coll., Fla. Office of Institutional Research.
PUB DATE Jun 95
NOTE 44p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Community Colleges; Educational Administration; *Faculty College Relationship; *Faculty Development; Faculty Recruitment; Faculty Workload; *Full Time Faculty; *Instructional Improvement; Instructional Leadership; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Miami Dade Community College FL

ABSTRACT

The Teaching/Learning Project (TLP) begun in Florida at Miami-Dade Community College in 1986, employs courses, orientation sessions, and mentors for new faculty at the college to help ensure instructional quality. In February 1993, a study was conducted to assess the first year experiences of new faculty and to evaluate the effectiveness of the TLP project. Questionnaires were distributed to 272 full-time faculty hired between 1985-86 and 1992-93. Responses were divided into 3 groups: Group I was composed of 39 faculty hired prior to implementation of the TLP, Group II consisted of 52 faculty hired when only the TLP's orientation session had been implemented, while Group III consisted of 110 faculty hired after the entire TLP process had been implemented. Study results included the following: (1) 72% reported that they received the support needed to carry out teaching responsibilities, while Group I respondents were less likely to report that they were received warmly than Group II or III respondents; (2) while only 65% of all groups agreed that they quickly learned where to go for help, Group II and II respondents were more likely to know than Group I respondents; (3) about 30% of all the groups found their teaching load difficult during the first year; and (4) 87% of the Group III faculty reported attending a campus orientation, compared to 27% of Groups II and III faculty. Appendices contain 11 data tables and the survey instrument. (TGI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 390 516

IMPLEMENTING TEACHING/LEARNING RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE FIRST YEAR EXPERIENCES OF NEW FACULTY

Research Report No. 95-05R

June 1995

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Belcher

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

IR Miami-Dade Community College District Administration

Institutional Research

JC 960 161

Miami-Dade Community College

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IMPLEMENTING TEACHING/LEARNING RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE FIRST YEAR EXPERIENCES OF NEW FACULTY

Research Report No. 95-05R

June 1995

Marcia J. Belcher
Associate Dean

Miami-Dade Community College

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Cathy Morris, Dean

Table of Contents

Page

List of Tables ii

Introduction 1

Methodology 3

Results of Multiple-Choice Items 4

- Understanding of Job Requirements 4
- Support During First Year 5
- Job Requirements 5
- Success of First Year 6
- Participation in Teaching/Learning Components 6
- Prior Experience of New Faculty 6
- Course Loads and Schedules 7
- Combined Impact of Experience, Project Participation, and Course Loads 7

Results of Open-Ended Items 9

- First Year Surprises 10
- Hardest Things to Do During The First Year 12
- What Helped New Faculty During Their First Year 14
- Things New Faculty Wish They Had Known During the First Year 16
- What the College Could Do to Help New Faculty 17

Summary and Conclusions 19

Appendix A 34

Appendix B 37

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Number of Faculty Who Were Surveyed and Who Responded by Year of Hiring	23
2	First Year Experiences of New Faculty Survey Results Based on Starting Year at M-DCC	24-25
3	Participation in Orientation and Mentoring Based on Starting Year	26
4	Part-Time Experience at Miami-Dade Community College Prior to Hiring as Full-Time Faculty	27
5	Type of Prior Teaching Experience	28
6	Number of Preparations During First Term as Full-Time Faculty Member	29
7	Overloads First Year	30
8	Test of Differences in Total Score Based on Number of Years of Experience, Part-Time Experience at M-DCC, and Type of Prior Experience	31
9	Differences in Total Score Based on Number of Preparation First Term, Assigned Overloads First Year, and Campus Location	31
10	Differences in Total Score Based on Group Membership, Helpful Mentoring, Attendance at Orientations, and Mentor Assignment	32
11	Content of Responses to Open-Ended Questions on New Faculty Survey Based on Year of Arrival at M-DCC	33

Implementing Teaching/Learning Project Recommendations To Improve First Year Experiences of New Faculty

Introduction

The Teaching/Learning Project began at Miami-Dade Community College in 1986 with the goals of improving the quality of teaching and learning at the College, making teaching at M-DCC a professionally rewarding career, and making teaching and learning the focal point of college activities and decision-making processes. One impetus behind starting the Project was the fact that about 30-35% of the faculty were expected to retire in the next five to ten years. M-DCC's reputation was based on the talents of its current faculty. How could we ensure that new faculty would carry on the tradition of excellence? Without a clear understanding of what the College sought in teaching excellence and without a plan to turn these understandings into actions, the clear possibility existed that M-DCC could slide into mediocrity.

Because the issues related to turnover were recognized as significant, the New Faculty subcommittee was one of the four committees constituted in the kick-off of the Teaching/Learning Project. By the Fall of 1988, the committee had finished its work and a series of recommendations had begun to be implemented. Among the first was a five-day orientation held for new faculty who began that Fall. Other recommendations from the committee included lightening the workload of new faculty their first year through reducing the number of preparations, not permitting overloads, developing a program where mentors were assigned to all new faculty, and providing a schedule of classes that was similar to the schedules of more tenured faculty.

Fall 1989 brought other changes. It was the beginning of two courses designed to give faculty effective teaching skills and classroom research background. In addition, by the end of Fall, 1989, a center for Teaching and Learning was established on Kendall campus, and advertising had begun to fill similar positions on North, Wolfson, and Medical Center campuses. By the Fall of 1990, Centers were established on all campuses (except Homestead) and a mentoring program for new faculty was in place. In addition, a

Statement of Faculty Excellence had been approved outlining the key characteristics of what constituted excellence. An advancement package that would change the way faculty were evaluated, received continuing contract, and were promoted would soon follow. One piece--a Student Feedback Survey--began being piloted in the Fall of 1990.

It was not surprising, therefore, that when the Teaching/Learning Project Steering Committee decided to evaluate the Project in some key areas that it chose new faculty as one of its initial focuses. After discussion with the Steering Committee, the following questions formed the basis of the evaluation:

1. Did new faculty know what they were getting into when they agreed to teach at M-DCC? Did they understand what would be expected of them, what M-DCC values were, what type of student was served, and job benefits? Did faculty hired after the Teaching/Learning Project have a better understanding than those hired before?

2. Did new faculty feel supported during their first year at the College? Did faculty hired after the Teaching/Learning Project feel more supported than those hired before?

3. Did new faculty find their job requirements to be difficult? Were there differences depending on whether they were hired before or after the initiation of the Teaching/Learning Project?

4. Did new faculty judge their first year an overall success? Did this judgment differ for those who began after the Teaching/Learning Project?

5. How much did new faculty participate in the components designed to help them? Did new faculty attend an orientation when it was offered? Did they receive a mentor? How much of this activity was occurring prior to the Teaching/Learning Project?

6. Who were new faculty members? Were they new to the College and inexperienced as assumed by many subcommittees? Has the type of faculty member hired changed during the span of the Teaching/Learning Project?

7. Did new faculty have reduced loads, preparations, and schedules as recommended?

8. Overall, could differences be found in survey responses based on experience brought to the College, participation in various Teaching/Learning Project components, and first-year experiences based on teaching load and campus?

9. What did new faculty say they needed their first year? What was surprising? What helped? What was hard? What recommendations would they make to the College to help other new faculty?

Methodology

To answer the questions listed above, a survey was developed (see Appendix A). The first part of the survey contained a series of multiple-choice items designed to answer the first eight sets of questions. The second part of the survey had five open-ended items that addressed question set 9. The survey asked faculty to think back and respond to the items based on their first-year experiences.

Human Resources provided a list of faculty who were new to the College in full-time positions and who began in August of 1985 or later. Individuals who were already in full-time positions at the College but new to faculty status were eliminated from the list. The survey was sent in February of 1993 with a follow-up to those who did not return the survey (see Appendix B).

Table 1 shows the number of faculty, by starting year, who received and who returned the survey. The overall return rate was 78%, with newer faculty showing a slightly higher return rate.

Based on starting year, the new faculty were divided into three groups to analyze their survey responses. Group I consisted of faculty who joined the College during the 1985-86, 1986-87, or 1987-88 academic years. This group, consisting of 56 faculty, began at a time either prior to or during the time the Teaching/Learning Project was being discussed but before any concrete actions had been taken on committee recommendations. Group II consisted of faculty who joined the College during 1988-89 or 1989-90. This group of 73 should have experienced an orientation to the College and received a mentor. However, the Teaching/Learning Centers were not yet operational on all campuses and the courses were being piloted with veteran faculty. By the Fall of 1990, however, the Steering Committee agreed that the key elements for new faculty should have been in place. Group III covered the last three years and included 143 faculty.

The survey results were analyzed in several ways. Each item was tested for differences among the three groups using the Chi-Square technique. In addition, a total score on positive outcomes was calculated for each respondent using all the items (except item 12 on receiving mentoring) after the responses to negatively worded items were reversed. The total score was then standardized at a mean of 100 and standard deviation of 10 and tested for group differences using Analysis of Variance and multiple regression techniques. Further analyses were conducted to test for differences based on interventions received and type of experience the faculty member brought to the institution. All statistical analyses were conducted using the .05 level of significance.

The open-ended items were content-analyzed and grouped into six general themes: administrative support issues, campus climate, interaction with colleagues, job requirements, comments about students, and other. Though the categories were somewhat overlapping, especially the administrative and job requirements categories, comments were assigned to only one category. If a response covered multiple categories, separate sentences would be assigned to the appropriate categories.

Results of Multiple Choice Items

The first part of the results section discusses findings using the multiple-choice items of the survey. The number and percent of responses to each of these items by group can be found in Table 2. Much of the following discussion will refer to this table. This section covers the first eight question sets laid out previously.

Understanding of Job Requirements

In general, most new faculty (75% or more) were not surprised at the composition of the student body, knew what was expected of them, and knew what M-DCC stood for when they took the job. (See items 1-3 of Table 2). This was true for all three groups and there were no significant differences among them.

One on-going problem the survey showed was understanding employee benefits. A presentation on this topic is included in the orientation for new faculty, and groups

which should have received the orientation showed more agreement on this item. However, the differences were not statistically significant and overall, only 48% agreed that they understood employee benefits (see item 9 of Table 2).

Support During First Year

In terms of support their first year, few (14%) felt lonely at work. Most (72%) reported that they received the support needed to carry out their teaching responsibilities and that their colleagues greeted them warmly and helped them adjust (82% agreement). Faculty who joined the College after the start of the Teaching/Learning Project were significantly more likely to report that they were received warmly compared to those who arrived earlier. There was no statistically significant difference for the other two items. (See Items 4, 6 and 7 of Table 2.)

Those who began after the start of the Teaching/Learning Project were also more likely to know where to go for help than those who began prior to the Project (see item 10 of Table 2). In general, however, only 65% of new faculty agreed that they quickly learned where to go for help.

The biggest statistical difference between groups occurred on the item that asked new faculty whether their mentor helped them. Faculty who came to the College after the full implementation of the Project agreed with this item 77% of the time compared to 39% of those who started prior to the Project. Note that faculty who began prior to the implementation of the College-wide program for mentoring were likely to leave this item blank, though some individuals indicated they had a successful mentoring relationship. (See item 12 of Table 2).

Job Requirements

About 30% found their teaching load difficult the first year (see item 5 of Table 2). About the same percentage found the paperwork overwhelming (item 11) and thought their schedule was worse than those of more established faculty (see item 13). Again, there were no significant differences among groups on these items.

Success of First Year

In general, 86% of new faculty labeled their first year a success (see Item 14). While the percentages were higher for the newest group of faculty (90% vs. 80%), the differences were not statistically significant. Only 16% agreed that they didn't know how they had survived their first year (see item 8 of Table 2).

Participation in Teaching/Learning Components

Did new faculty experience all the Teaching/Learning Project components? Some campuses or departments were already conducting orientations and assigning mentors prior to the Teaching/Learning Project. And some faculty may have failed to take advantage of components available once the project was begun. Table 3 displays some results to answer these questions.

While 70% of those who started after a district orientation was available report attending it, so do 22% of those who began prior to the availability of an orientation. For the campus orientation, 87% of the newest faculty report attending one compared to 41% of the earliest group. More were assigned mentors than attended district orientation. For the newest group of faculty, 88% report being assigned a mentor compared to 27% of the earliest group.

This set of results shows that we cannot assume that everyone new to the College received orientation and mentoring after it was available through the Project, nor can we assume that no one who began prior to the Teaching/Learning Project received a similar type of intervention. The implication is that significant differences on items that would be associated with the Project and measured by starting year at the College will be more difficult to attain.

Prior Experience of New Faculty

Another factor that could influence results is the experience that new faculty bring with them when they begin their tenure at Miami-Dade and what they experience in terms of teaching responsibilities their first year. One might expect, for example, that new faculty who are already familiar with the College and have prior teaching experience

would find their first year easier, regardless of what other supports are in place. If there are changes in these factors, they may influence results and obscure differences.

Table 4 shows that an increasing percentage of faculty first worked as part-timers at the College before being hired to new full-time positions. Prior to the Teaching/Learning Project, 43% reported that they worked at the College part-time first compared to 69% of those hired in the last three years. This increase was statistically significant.

Table 5 shows that more of the newest group of faculty were coming with experience, especially community college experience. While 15% of those hired prior to the Teaching/Learning Project had no experience, only 6% of the newest group reported this. In addition, 32% of the newest group reported that their experience had been at the community college level compared to only 15% of those hired prior to the initiation of the Project. Thus, we may assume that the new faculty who arrived after the full implementation of the Project were also the group that should have been able to handle their first year responsibilities with the greatest ease. Recall, however, that even though level of experience changed, items asking about difficulty and success of the first year experiences showed no differences by starting date.

Course Loads and Schedules

One recommendation from the New Faculty Committee was that new faculty should have few preparations and no overloads their first year. However, the practice of giving new faculty a large number of preparations and overloads has not been decreasing as expected. Table 6 shows that about half of the faculty were given four or more preparations their first semester. Table 7 shows that two-thirds had overloads their first year. Recall, too, that about 30% of new faculty reported their schedules were worse than more established faculty (see item 13 of Table 2). Again, this finding indicates that Project recommendations were not being followed as closely as many may have assumed.

Combined Impact of Experience, Project Participation, and Course Loads

So far then, using item-by-item results, differences have been found between responses from faculty who arrived after the full implementation of the Teaching/Learning

Project and those who arrived before in the area of support their first year. In addition, we have found that not all new faculty who arrived after the full implementation of the Project experienced the designed interventions and furthermore, that some faculty who arrived prior to the Project did experience an orientation and mentoring. Newer faculty brought more experience with them to the College and carried heavy preparation loads during their first year than recommended.

The analysis so far has been conducted at the item level. But might some larger effect be found when item responses were combined that couldn't be seen by looking at the items one-by-one? In addition, the analysis was predicated on the assumption that starting year was a good proxy variable for assessing Project participation. Results have shown, however, that participation was more diffuse than had been assumed and that the type of faculty hired shifted across time as well. Thus, to see if a somehow different approach to the data would reveal other findings, item responses were summed to produce a total score with a mean of 100. Then, using the total score as the measure where differences should be found, the factors that could make that difference were grouped into three categories: (1) experience brought to the College (as indicated by number of years of experience, part-time experience at M-DCC, and type of prior experience), (2) first year academic environment (as indicated by number of preparations first term, assigned overloads, and campus location), and (3) participation in Teaching/Learning Project program activities (as indicated by starting year, assignment and helpfulness of mentor, and participation in the three orientations).

Table 8 displays the results when looking for differences in total score based on number of prior years of experience, part-time experience at M-DCC before being hired full-time, and type of prior experience (e.g., community college, university, K-12 system). These results were obtained by doing analysis of variance and multiple regression processes and tested at the .05 level of significance. There were no significant differences based on the prior experience variables. Thus, either prior experience did not play a role in first-year experiences on the job or this questionnaire did not adequately capture what those differences might be.

The same type of statistical analyses were done to produce the data in Table 9. These results show that there are no differences in total score based on the number of preparations new faculty had their first term, whether they had assigned overloads their first year, or the campus on which they were located. Thus, although new faculty were carrying too many preparations and overloads based on Teaching/Learning recommendations, it did not seem to affect responses to the multiple-choice items of the survey. In addition, no real differences emerged depending upon the campus where the new faculty were located. Again, either first year load makes no difference or this survey did not capture what those differences might be.

Table 10 displays the results for differences in total score when using variables related to Teaching/Learning. Results showed a highly significant relationship based on the helpfulness of the mentor. There was a 15-point spread in mean scores between the groups that did not find their mentor helpful and the group that thought their mentor was very helpful. A second relationship was found based on attendance at a college-wide orientation. Those who attended had an average score that was three points higher than those who did not attend. Other variables did not produce significant differences, including group membership based on year of entry to the College. This non-significant finding may explain why few differences were found on the item-level results for group membership.

Results of Open-Ended Items

The second part of the survey consisted of five open-end items to which faculty responded. The result was 28 pages of single-spaced comments. Responses were organized into a classification system containing six major themes: Administrative support issues, college and campus climate, interactions with colleagues, job requirements, comments on the student body, and other miscellaneous comments that did not readily fit into any of the other categories. Most comments concerned administrative support and job requirements. In the following section, an attempt is made to give the reader a flavor of the comments and note where differences seemed to occur among the three groups. A proportional breakdown of comments by theme can be found in Table 11.

First Year Surprises

The largest proportion of comments to this item (26%) could be classified as pertaining to administrative support issues, especially related to how the system works and what resources are available to faculty. Above all else, new faculty, and especially those who began after the Teaching/Learning Project, were amazed at the amount of paperwork required by the job. Most were quite direct with their comments, as indicated in the following examples:

During my first year, I was really surprised...

"At the bureaucracy! It's cumbersome, needless, inefficient and frustrating (need I say more??!)."

"By the tremendous amount of paperwork that had to be done."

"By the volume of 'paper flow' and the endless bureaucratic system."

"At the amount of paperwork and meetings that were part of SOP."

"By the amount of paperwork."

Many new faculty, especially those who were hired in 1990 or later, commented about the resources available to them as a second topic under the theme of administrative support issues. Most of these comments were positive, as shown by the examples below, though a few were negative in tone.

During my first year, I was really surprised...

"To find so much equipment within easy access."

"At the availability of reference materials and audiovisual services."

"By the many activities and workshops available to new faculty."

"By the lack of support staff and clerical staff, and/or the necessary equipment, such as computers, to do the necessary work myself."

The second big area where new faculty made comments were related to students (17% of comments). A majority of comments in this area related to students' approach

to learning, with about half being positive in nature and half being negative. This appeared to be unrelated to year of hiring. Some examples are:

During my first year, I was really surprised...

> "By the enthusiasm of my students."
>
> "By the hostility and lack of respect for faculty by students. It seems almost routine for students who are unhappy with grades to accuse faculty of discriminating on racial, religious, and/or gender."
>
> "How eager the students were to learn, and how appreciative they were."
>
> "At the poor study habits and general language level of my students. I thought they would be more able to continue upper-level studies without spoon-feeding. I had to work a bit harder than I thought I would on basics."

Others spoke of the problems of poor academic preparation and placement.

During my first year, I was really surprised...

> "To find out that some students could not write paragraphs. I wish college prep could have had them first."
>
> "That there were students in my ESL classes who had graduated from high schools here in Miami."
>
> "At the low level (academically speaking) students brought into the classroom."

The area which received the third greatest number of comments was interactions with colleagues (16% of total comments). While comments in this area were both positive and negative, the newest group of faculty had the greatest number of positive things to say. As one new faculty member put it: "I discovered that department chairs have 25 hours a day to deal with all new people's questions and doubts!" Another noted that he/she was surprised "at the warmth and kindness of people in my department." A few, however, had less positive experiences. One noted that he/she was surprised by the "lack of support from 'long term' faculty."

The fourth area, "Other", included mainly comments from faculty who said they were not really surprised at anything. Many of these faculty noted that they had already been working at M-DCC so they were familiar with the College. About 15% of the comments fell into this area.

Hardest Things to Do During the First Year

It was not surprising to find that based on the number of comments (55% of the total), new faculty found it hardest to deal with all the job requirements their first year. This appeared to be true whatever the year they arrived at the College. In particular, they found it difficult to establish priorities, to organize and plan their work life as shown by the comments below:

The hardest thing I had to do my first year was...

"Complete all the preps, teach, attend meetings and be responsive to students without completing many hours at home working on materials needed."

"Adapt to a full time class schedule plus 10 office hours, and keep up with the overwhelming number of papers to grade."

"To prepare teaching material and teach at the same time."

"Find the time to investigate and become involved in things that were related to, but not required parts of my workload."

"Go to school for course work, maintain a family and teach."

"Prioritize my time."

"Organize my time and get everything done and figure out exactly what I was to teach."

Others found the teaching load or the schedule very difficult to deal with.

The hardest thing I had to do my first year was...

"Grade 250 papers per term."

"To take on everything at once, i.e., 3 different classes plus extra duty work."

"Teach both spring and summer terms. I taught straight for two years before I had my first vacation."

"Prepare 5 new classes."

"Grade an overwhelming number of essays and exams. We need tutors or helpers if we want to give formative assessment."

"Get used to teaching a schedule that ran from 8 AM to 8 PM."

"Deal with the schedule. It was split on two days early and late classes until 10:35."

"Teach an overload in my first semester. I opted to do this and regretted it as I taught six writing courses."

A third group of comments that fell under "Job Requirements" indicated that some faculty had difficulty failing students. Some fewer found the advisement and counseling process the most difficult part of their first year.

Most of the remaining comments (29%) dealt with administrative support issues (see Table 11). The comments in this area most frequently focused on how hard it was to learn the way the system operates, both in terms of procedures and the amount of paperwork required. This appeared equally true of all three groups.

The hardest thing I had to do my first year was...

"Learn 'who was who' in administration and how the College was organized."

"Become familiar with the inordinate number of forms and signatures necessary to survive."

"Try to find out how to find and use the College's ancillary services since there was no orientation program in 1985."

"Figure out how 'the system' works. I still don't have everything down."

A second group of comments under administrative support issues related to the requirements to take the two courses developed as part of the Teaching/Learning Project and offered through the University of Miami. This area, of course, was mentioned by newer faculty who came after the course requirements were in place. Faculty found the additional time burden difficult to include in an already full schedule. In addition, some who mentioned the course(s) did not find them helpful. As once faculty member stated: "[The hardest thing I had to do my first year was] enrolling in University of Miami courses. The material may be helpful to first time teachers.... Experienced faculty should have the option of real development."

A final group of comments grouped under administrative support issues involved the difficulty in participating in committee or reaccreditation work the first year. While fewer mentioned this as a difficulty, those who did mention it found it very hard or at least time-consuming during a period when time was very precious.

What Helped New Faculty During Their First Year

Respondents cited their colleagues most frequently when asked this question (60% of the responses fell under this category). At a distant second and third place were comments related to administrative support (16%) and job requirements (11%).

The ways that their colleagues helped new faculty seemed to fall into three major categories: help with the mechanics of the job, providing an ear to let new faculty talk about their teaching experiences, and providing a perspective that more seasoned faculty had and new faculty may lack. Faculty who arrived after the initiation of the Teaching/Learning Project were more likely to mention their mentors and chairpersons as individuals who were particularly helpful compared to faculty who arrived prior to the Teaching/Learning Project. Each of these areas will be discussed below.

Some new faculty mentioned how their colleagues helped them with the tasks of teaching. The following comments illustrate this theme:

It helped alot when...

> "Professors I shared an office with gave me helpful hints; other professors reviewed tests I had made up to let me see their tests; my mentor explained various aspects of how the department/college operated."
>
> "The faculty gave me ideas and materials for new lectures."
>
> "Other more experienced instructors suggested various methods of presenting material."

Others mentioned more general support activities:

It helped alot when...

> "There was someone around to 'sincerely' discuss the difficulties of teaching effectively; and how to be a good teacher."

"Individual faculty and administrators took time to give advice and pass on personal experience and lessons learned.... It allowed me to understand the 'bigger picture', so to speak."

"People expressed understanding of the fact that the first year is difficult."

The second group of responses received dealt with administrative support (16% of responses given). Here, as in the prior group of responses, were evidences of the impact of the Teaching/Learning Project. Faculty mentioned the college-wide orientation as being helpful and that the Teaching/Learning Centers were supportive during the first year. Some examples of comments are:

It helped alot when...

"I had orientation the first week. I gave me a great first impression of Miami-Dade."

"We had the new faculty orientation sessions."

"TLC covered areas like how to guide students through regulations."

"I discussed procedure with my mentor, and attended the first-year meetings coordinated by Dr. Lipof."

"Susan Kah made computerized gradebook available to us, as well as the availability of computerized test banks known."

"I attended CTL workshops on developing self-assessment and portfolios."

Others mentioned that it helped them when college procedures were clearly spelled out. Several found a checklist of information (i.e., library card, computer access, xerox access) to be helpful.

The only other area that received more than 10% of responses was the area of job requirements (11% of total comments). Some indicated they were thankful when there was time to rest, either for a day, the weekend, or a term. Others said they simply felt better after they had gotten their first term or year "under their belts." Several others were grateful for the syllabi and tests they were given and not being required to develop their own for the first term.

Things New Faculty Wish They Had Known During the First Year

This question asked faculty what they wished they had known during their first year. It should be noted that the fewest number of faculty chose to respond to this item (less than half the number of responses compared to other items). Responses fell mainly into four of the six areas, with the bulk of responses (50%) falling under the category of Administrative Support Issues. In this area differences were again found in the responses of faculty hired prior to the Teaching/Learning Project and those hired after it was in place. Those hired earlier wrote most frequently of salary and benefits issues:

I wish I had known then that...

"I could have bargained to start at a higher salary."

"During my interview with the Associate Dean I was supposed to be given information on rank and salary."

"My salary would steadily fall behind that of the public schools."

Newer faculty were more likely to mention the portfolio development process:

I wish I had known then that...

"So much documentation would be required for my portfolio."

"The system of promotions is what it is. I would have sought employment elsewhere."

"The process of securing continuous contract and a promotion was so laborious. I really do think that it mires us all in the needless muck of bureaucracy."

The second highest category (20%) related to job requirements. Faculty who made comments in this area were most likely to have wished they had known they could structure their schedule better or that there would be so much work:

Some examples of comments are:

I wish I had known then that...

"My schedule could have been structured so that I could have less of a preparation load."

"Class size was going to be unmanageable."

"I would have to teach so many different courses and what those courses would be earlier."

"I would be asked to do so much more than teach."

The other area which generated at least 10% of the responses was "Other" (14%). The "Other" category contained a series of idiosyncratic responses (e.g., "Traffic in Miami defies logic and reasoning! It's a nightmare. It does make me think not to come back to work the following day! (just ventilating!)").

What the College Could Do to Help New Faculty

The last open-ended item asked faculty to respond to the following: "It would Help New Faculty if the College Would...." A large majority of the responses (80%) fell under the category of "Administrative Support." Most of the remainder (11%) fell under the related category of "Job Requirements." Most of the suggestions made could already be predicted based on responses to the prior questions.

One of the major findings from this group of comments was the value of the mentor and orientation programs. The most frequently given comment from faculty who arrived prior to the implementation of the Teaching/Learning Project was the continuation of the mentor program. As one faculty member put it, "...Would have established the mentor program earlier. I had none!" More recent faculty who had mentors were more concerned with "fine-tuning" the mentor program. As one said, "Make certain each new faculty has a mentor assigned and follow-up on that relationship (monitoring effectiveness)...." Another simply admonished, "Select mentors carefully!"

Faculty were also very positive about the orientation program and were interested in modifying or maintaining it. As one faculty member said, "I feel the College has done a great job orienting new faculty.... I do think it would help if the department chairs took a more active role." Another said, "Continue the current outstanding orientation program. You deserve an A+ for planning and execution." Suggestions included reducing the general orientation and expanding the campus orientation, providing more information on benefits presented more slowly, scheduling an orientation with the department secretary, providing a checklist or pamphlet of essential information for the new teacher,

orienting to the city of Miami, and providing a little time after orientation to get ready for classes or follow the assigned mentors.

Another recurring theme from the comments made involved salary and benefits. One faculty member suggested, "Give more details on raise and retirement 'benefits' at the time of hiring (interviews)." Another said, "Be forthright about salary during the job interview. It would help the other job applicants if they were notified ASAP that they didn't get the position." One faculty reflected the sentiments of several others when he/she simply said, "Pay us more."

Several faculty encouraged administrators to continue to pay special attention to them after the orientation. They suggested that discussions could be held to see if there were problems and concerns and if the mentoring relationship was working. One faculty member mentioned the Friday meetings with their campus academic dean as a beneficial example of follow-up.

A number of faculty encouraged College administrators to reduce new faculty work load during the first year. Suggestions included not allowing any overloads, reducing the number of preparations, reducing the number of classes taught or the size of the classes, not expecting any committee work the first year, and reducing the course load when taking the required courses for faculty.

Others thought it would be helpful to provide further encouragement for new faculty to get out and meet others. One faculty member suggested, "Encourage them to attend senate meetings. This is a good way of getting to know faculty from other departments and a good starting point for getting involved in College activities." Another suggested, "Make more campus-wide activities and workshops available to enable them to meet colleagues from other departments."

Finally, several faculty found the portfolio process to be burdensome. One faculty member put it this way: "Reduce the volumes of proof one feels obligated to provide in

order to get continuing contract and be promoted under T/L guidelines." Another said, "Simplify the review process. (It is overwhelming for new faculty)."

Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to assess the first year experiences of new faculty and to evaluate how the Teaching/Learning Project had played a role in shaping those experiences and could improve those experiences. This was accomplished by developing a two-part survey and administering it to faculty who were newly hired at the College as full-timers between 1985-86 and 1992-93. The first part of the survey contained a series of multiple-choice items designed to assess whether new faculty knew what to expect when they arrived at M-DCC, the amount of support they received during their first year, perceived difficulty of the job, and overall judgment of first-year success. In addition, this part of the survey asked for information to assess the extent of participation in Project components, prior experience of new faculty, and number of preparations and overloads during the first year. The second part of the survey asked a series of open-ended questions designed to amplify findings from Part 1 and to provide direction for the College in improving first year experiences of faculty. The survey was administered in February of 1993.

Using the results of the multiple-choice items, the biggest difference between those who were hired prior to the Project (before 1988-89) and those who were hired after was found to be in the area of support for new faculty. Those who were hired after the Project were more likely to report that they were greeted warmly by their colleagues, they knew where to go for help (though less than two-thirds overall knew where to go), and that they had a helpful mentor.

One reason for these findings may have been due to the assignment of mentors and attendance at the college-wide orientation. New faculty who reported they had a positive mentor experience had a total survey score that was 15 points higher than those who did not. Another significant difference was in attendance at the college-wide orientation, which produced a three-point difference.

Some other interesting differences appeared in analyzing the pattern of responses to some of the open-ended items. While many faculty professed to be surprised by the amount of paperwork involved in their jobs, the newest group of faculty (who had experienced the Teaching/Learning Project), was more likely to point specifically to the amount of paperwork involved in the promotion process. This group was also more likely to mention that they were surprised at the number of good resources available to them to support them in their teaching.

When asked what helped them get through their first year, most new faculty mentioned the help provided by their colleagues. The group who had experienced the Teaching/Learning Project, however, was much more likely to mention specifically the help provided by their mentors and their department chairpersons. In addition, a number noted that attendance at the orientations and contact with their Teaching/Learning Centers had proven helpful.

When asked what they wish they had known, other Project-related differences emerged. While many new faculty across the years mentioned that they wished they had been told more about salary, benefits issues, and job requirements, some of the newest group of faculty said that they wished they had known more about the portfolio requirements since these had been burdensome.

Other parts of the survey showed a common picture of first year experiences despite year of hiring. Most faculty (over 75%) reported that they knew what they were getting into in terms of job requirements when they signed on with M-DCC. Many fewer (48%), however, had a good understanding of the benefits package despite the addition of a presentation at the College-wide orientation. About 30% found their first year job requirements to be difficult in terms of course load, paperwork, and their schedules compared to more veteran faculty. Most (72%) reported that they received the support needed to carry out their teaching responsibilities. Most (86%) labeled their first year a success, and only 16% agreed that they didn't know how they survived.

The open-ended items indicated that many new faculty, whatever their year of hiring, found it most difficult to deal with their job requirements during the first year. Responses indicated that many found it difficult to establish priorities and get everything done in the time allotted. This was exacerbated by coping with lack of understanding in how to accomplish things, difficult schedules, and heavy loads. In addition, several new faculty mentioned that the two required courses through the University of Miami had placed an additional and unnecessary burden upon them.

The prior experience that new faculty reported also differed from that assumed by some Teaching/Learning subcommittees. Most (69%) of the newest group of faculty were hired after they already had part-time experience with the College. Very few (6%) of the newest faculty had no experience at all. The most recent group had more experience than those hired prior to the implementation of the Project. This finding has implications for orientation and the two required University of Miami courses.

This study began with the assumption that we could delineate a time "before the Teaching/Learning Project" and also a time "after the Teaching/Learning Project" when all the "new" things proposed by the Project would be in place. In regards to new faculty, this meant (among other things) the support of a mentor and the campus Teaching/Learning Center, college-wide and campus orientations, a reduced number of preparations, no overloads, and courses to further prepare new faculty. This turned out NOT to be the case. Some things that were implemented College-wide by the Teaching/Learning Project were already happening on some campuses and in some departments. For example, of the group hired prior to 1988-89, 41% indicated they had attended a campus orientation and 27% said they were assigned a mentor. Furthermore, though most faculty who arrived after the implementation of the Teaching/Learning Project participated in its most visible components, this was not true for all. About 70% reported attending the College-wide orientation, 87% a campus orientation, and 88% reported they had assigned mentors. Thus, trying to look at changes brought about by the project based solely on year of entry to the College produced findings that were weakened because of the participation/non-participation problem. This should be remembered when reviewing the findings.

Another assumption that appears to be untrue is that the number of preparations and overloads the first year for new faculty was reduced. For the group hired after the full implementation of the Project, 50% reported four or more preparations their first term and 73% reported overloads their first year. In the open-ended item which asked what the College could do to help faculty their first year, a number of faculty indicated that it would be helpful to reduce the number of preparations, overloads, and committee work the first year.

The Teaching/Learning Project has been a significant part of M-DCC college life for at least five years. Many changes have occurred in a variety of areas as a result of the Project, and more are still to come. Indeed, some have taken place between the time that new faculty were surveyed in early 1993 and the time of writing this report, two years later. These include modifying the two required courses into one unified course, streamlining the portfolio process including changes in the required documentation, and tightening the mentoring selection and training process. These changes were brought about in part from reviewing preliminary findings from this survey over one year ago.

This study focused on new faculty, one of the early thrusts of the Project. It has shown that the Teaching/Learning Project has had a significant impact on new faculty in some ways, especially in the support for the teaching process the first year. It has also pointed the way to some possible changes, some of which have already occurred. Perhaps this report can form the basis for a dialogue on recommendations to further support the backbone of M-DCC's academic future--its new faculty.

Table 1

Number of Faculty Who Were Surveyed and Who Responded by Year of Hiring

Academic Year Hired	Number Surveyed	Number Who Responded	Percent Responding
Group I			
1985-86	18	10	55.6%
1986-87	17	10	58.8%
1987-88	21	19	90.5%
Subtotal	56	39	69.6%
Group II			
1988-89	32	24	75.0%
1989-90	41	28	68.3%
Subtotal	73	52	71.2%
Group III			
1990-91	55	42	76.4%
1991-92	59	48	81.4%
1992-93	29	20	69.0%
Subtotal	143	110	76.9%
Starting Date Not Reported			
Subtotal	n/a	11	n/a
Total	272	212	77.9%

Table 2

First Year Experiences of New Faculty Survey Results

Based on Starting Year at M-DCC

Group	Response: Disagree Number	Disagree Percent	Neither Number	Neither Percent	Agree Number	Agree Percent	Total	Significant Difference Among Groups
Item 1: When I First Walked Into the Classroom, I Was Surprised at the Composition of the Miami-Dade Student Body								
I: 1985-86--1987-88	27	73.0%	7	18.9%	3	8.1%	37	
II: 1988-89--1989-90	40	76.9%	4	7.7%	8	15.4%	52	
III: 1990-91--1992-93	79	74.5%	15	14.2%	12	11.3%	106	
Total	146	74.9%	26	13.3%	23	11.8%	195	
Frequency missing = 12								
Item 2: I Had a Good Idea of What Was Expected of Me When I Took the Job								
I: 1985-86--1987-88	5	13.5%	1	2.7%	31	83.8%	37	
II: 1988-89--1989-90	11	20.4%	4	7.4%	39	72.2%	54	
III: 1990-91--1992-93	11	9.9%	9	8.1%	91	82.0%	111	
Total	27	13.4%	14	6.9%	161	79.7%	202	
Frequency missing = 5								
Item 3: I Knew What Miami-Dade Stood for When I Started								
I: 1985-86--1987-88	6	16.2%	7	18.9%	24	64.9%	37	
II: 1988-89--1989-90	8	15.1%	4	7.5%	41	77.4%	53	
III: 1990-91--1992-93	14	12.6%	10	9.0%	87	78.4%	111	
Total	28	13.9%	21	10.4%	152	75.6%	201	
Frequency missing = 6								
Item 4: I Felt Lonely at Work My First Year								
I: 1985-86--1987-88	26	70.3%	6	16.2%	5	13.5%	37	
II: 1988-89--1989-90	42	77.8%	3	5.6%	9	16.7%	54	
III: 1990-91--1992-93	86	76.8%	12	10.7%	14	12.5%	112	
Total	154	75.9%	21	10.3%	28	13.8%	203	
Frequency missing = 4								
Item 5: My Teaching Load the First Year Was Difficult to Handle								
I: 1985-86--1987-88	19	51.4%	6	16.2%	12	32.4%	37	
II: 1988-89--1989-90	34	64.2%	2	3.8%	17	32.1%	53	
III: 1990-91--1992-93	69	62.2%	10	9.0%	32	28.8%	111	
Total	122	60.7%	18	9.0%	61	30.3%	201	
Frequency missing = 6								
Item 6: I Received the Support I Needed in Order to Carry Out My Teaching Responsibilities								
I: 1985-86--1987-88	6	16.2%	10	27.0%	21	56.8%	37	
II: 1988-89--1989-90	8	15.1%	4	7.5%	41	77.4%	53	
III: 1990-91--1992-93	12	10.6%	16	14.2%	85	75.2%	113	
Total	26	12.8%	30	14.8%	147	72.4%	203	
Frequency missing = 4								
Item 7: My Colleagues Received Me Warmly and Helped Me Adjust								
I: 1985-86--1987-88	5	13.5%	5	13.5%	27	73.0%	37	
II: 1988-89--1989-90	8	14.8%	1	1.9%	45	83.3%	54	
III: 1990-91--1992-93	5	4.4%	12	10.6%	96	85.0%	113	**
Total	18	8.8%	18	8.8%	168	82.4%	204	
Frequency missing = 3								
Item 8: When I Look Back Now On My First Year, I Don't See How I Survived								
I: 1985-86--1987-88	29	78.4%	2	5.4%	6	16.2%	37	
II: 1988-89--1989-90	40	75.5%	4	7.5%	9	17.0%	53	
III: 1990-91--1992-93	81	73.0%	13	11.7%	17	15.3%	111	
Total	150	74.6%	19	9.5%	32	15.9%	201	
Frequency missing = 6								

AB95009.2 XLS

Table 2

(continued)

First Year Experiences of New Faculty Survey Results

Based on Starting Year at M-DCC

Group	Response: Disagree Number	Disagree Percent	Neither Number	Neither Percent	Agree Number	Agree Percent	Total	Significant Difference Among Groups
Item 9: I Understood Employee Benefits and Options								
I: 1985-86--1987-88	18	48.6%	5	13.5%	14	37.8%	37	
II: 1988-89--1989-90	16	29.6%	10	18.5%	28	51.9%	54	
III: 1990-91--1992-93	42	37.2%	16	14.2%	55	48.7%	113	
Total	76	37.3%	31	15.2%	97	47.5%	204	
Frequency missing = 3								
Item 10: I Quickly Learned Where To Go When I Needed Help								
I: 1985-86--1987-88	12	33.3%	4	11.1%	20	55.6%	36	
II: 1988-89--1989-90	6	11.1%	8	14.8%	40	74.1%	54	
III: 1990-91--1992-93	16	14.3%	25	22.3%	71	63.4%	112	**
Total	34	16.8%	37	18.3%	131	64.9%	202	
Frequency missing = 5								
Item 11: The Paperwork and Forms Overwhelmed Me								
I: 1985-86--1987-88	15	40.5%	8	21.6%	14	37.8%	37	
II: 1988-89--1989-90	30	56.6%	12	22.6%	11	20.8%	53	
III: 1990-91--1992-93	45	40.2%	31	27.7%	36	32.1%	112	
Total	90	44.6%	51	25.2%	61	30.2%	202	*
Frequency missing = 5								
Item 12: My Mentor Helped Me								
I: 1985-86--1987-88	5	27.8%	6	33.3%	7	38.9%	18	
II: 1988-89--1989-90	9	18.8%	6	12.5%	33	68.8%	48	
III: 1990-91--1992-93	13	11.6%	13	11.6%	86	76.8%	112	**
Total	27	15.2%	25	14.0%	126	70.8%	178	
Frequency missing = 29								
Item 13: My First Year Schedule of Classes Was Worse Than Those of More Established Colleagues								
I: 1985-86--1987-88	23	62.2%	4	10.8%	10	27.0%	37	
II: 1988-89--1989-90	25	47.2%	12	22.6%	16	30.2%	53	
III: 1990-91--1992-93	56	50.9%	24	21.8%	30	27.3%	110	*
Total	104	52.0%	40	20.0%	56	28.0%	200	
Frequency missing = 7								
Item 14: Overall, I Would Judge My First Year of Teaching a Success								
I: 1985-86--1987-88	1	2.8%	6	16.7%	29	80.6%	36	
II: 1988-89--1989-90	3	5.6%	7	13.0%	44	81.5%	54	
III: 1990-91--1992-93	4	3.6%	7	6.3%	100	90.1%	111	
Total	8	4.0%	20	10.0%	173	86.1%	201	
Frequency missing = 6								

**Statistically significant at the .05 level using Chi-Square.

Table 3

Participation in Orientation and Mentoring Based on Starting Year

Group	Response: No Number	No Percent	Yes Number	Yes Percent	Total Number	Total Percent
District Orientation						
I: 1985-86--1987-88	29	78.4%	8	21.6%	37	100.0%
II: 1988-89--1989-90	16	29.6%	38	70.4%	54	100.0%
III: 1990-91--1992-93	34	30.1%	79	69.9%	113	100.0%
Total	79	38.7%	125	61.3%	204	100.0%
Frequency Missing = 3						
Campus Orientation						
I: 1985-86--1987-88	22	59.5%	15	40.5%	37	100.0%
II: 1988-89--1989-90	14	25.9%	40	74.1%	54	100.0%
III: 1990-91--1992-93	15	13.3%	98	86.7%	113	100.0%
Total	51	25.0%	153	75.0%	204	100.0%
Frequency Missing = 3						
Follow-Up Orientation						
I: 1985-86--1987-88	29	78.4%	8	21.6%	37	100.0%
II: 1988-89--1989-90	21	38.9%	33	61.1%	54	100.0%
III: 1990-91--1992-93	26	23.0%	87	77.0%	113	100.0%
Total	76	37.3%	128	62.7%	204	100.0%
Frequency Missing = 3						
Assigned Mentor						
I: 1985-86--1987-88	27	73.0%	10	27.0%	37	100.0%
II: 1988-89--1989-90	8	14.8%	46	85.2%	54	100.0%
III: 1990-91--1992-93	14	12.4%	99	87.6%	113	100.0%
Total	49	24.0%	155	76.0%	204	100.0%
Frequency Missing = 3						
Other						
I: 1985-86--1987-88	28	75.7%	9	24.3%	37	100.0%
II: 1988-89--1989-90	46	85.2%	8	14.8%	54	100.0%
III: 1990-91--1992-93	95	84.8%	17	15.2%	112	100.0%
Total	169	83.3%	34	16.7%	203	100.0%
Frequency Missing = 4						

Note: All results, except "Other" were statistically significant at the .05 level using Chi-Square.

Table 4

Part-Time Experience at Miami-Dade Community College

Prior to Hiring as Full-Time Faculty

	Response					
	Yes		No		Total	
Group	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
I: 1985-86--1987-88	15	42.9%	20	57.1%	35	100.0%
II: 1988-89--1989-90	33	62.3%	20	37.7%	53	100.0%
III: 1990-91--1992-93	77	69.4%	34	30.6%	111	100.0%
Total	125	62.8%	74	37.2%	199	100.0%

Frequency Missing = 8

Note: Results were statistically significant at the .05 level.

Table 5

Type of Prior Teaching Experience

	Prior Experience										
	K-12 System		Community College		University		Other		No Experience		
Group	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total
I: 1985 86 1987 88	8	30.8%	4	15.4%	8	30.8%	2	7.7%	4	15.4%	26
II: 1988 89 1989 90	5	11.9%	13	31.0%	7	16.7%	15	35.7%	2	4.8%	42
III: 1990 91 1992 93	22	28.2%	25	32.1%	18	23.1%	8	10.3%	5	6.4%	78
Total	35	24.0%	42	28.8%	33	22.6%	25	17.1%	11	7.5%	146

Frequency Missing = 61

Note: Results were statistically significant at the .05 level.

Table 6

Number of Preparations During First Term as Full-Time Faculty Member

Group	Number of Preparations						Total
	One or Two		Three		Four or More		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
I: 1985-86--1987-88	6	20.0%	6	20.0%	18	60.0%	30
II: 1988-89--1989-90	14	32.6%	14	32.6%	15	34.9%	43
III: 1990-91--1992-93	19	19.6%	29	29.9%	49	50.5%	97
Total	39	22.9%	49	28.8%	82	48.2%	170

Frequency Missing = 37

Note: Results were statistically non-significant.

Table 7

Overloads First Year

Group	Response: Yes Number	Yes Percent	No Number	No Percent	Total Number	Total Percent
I: 1985-86--1987-88	19	61.3%	12	38.7%	31	100.0%
II: 1988-89--1989-90	31	60.8%	20	39.2%	51	100.0%
III: 1990-91--1992-93	80	72.7%	30	27.3%	110	100.0%
Total	130	67.7%	62	32.3%	192	100.0%

Frequency Missing = 15

Note: Results were statistically non-significant.

Table 8

Test of Differences in Total Score Based on

Number of Years of Experience, Part-Time Experience at M-DCC, and

Type of Prior Experience

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Prob > F
Years Experience	1	217.52	217.52	2.48	0.12
Part-Time Experience	1	304.60	304.59	3.47	0.06
Prior Experience	4	356.67	89.17	1.02	0.40

R^2 = .08*, F = 2.06, N.S. at .05 level.

Table 9

Differences in Total Score Based on

Number of Preparation First Term, Assigned Overloads First Year, and

Campus Location

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Prob > F
Preparation First Term	2	77.16	38.58	0.45	0.64
Assigned Overloads	1	21.82	21.82	0.25	0.61
Campus Location	4	438.41	184.60	2.15	0.08

R^2 = .06*, F = 1.37, N.S. at .05 level.

*R^2 is a measure of the amount of variation in score totals which is accounted for by the chosen variables. For Table 8, R^2 = .08 means that only 8% of the variation can be attributed to the three experience variables.

Table 10

Differences in Total Score Based on Group Membership, Helpful Mentoring, Attendance at Orientations, and Mentor Assignment

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Prob > F
Starting Year	2	4.19	2.10	0.03	0.97
Mentor Helped	4	3534.38	883.60	11.64	0.00*
College-Wide Orientation	1	286.58	286.58	3.78	0.05*
Campus Orientation	1	27.58	27.58	0.36	0.55
Follow-up Orientation	1	26.52	26.52	0.35	0.56
Mentor Assigned	1	45.78	45.78	0.60	0.44

R^2 = .24, F = 5.30, p = .001.

* Significant

Means for "Mentor Helped"

Value	Number in Group	Mean
Strongly Disagree (1)	17	90.9
Disagree (2)	11	90.1
Neutral (3)	25	101.0
Agree (4)	65	99.6
Strongly Agree (5)	62	105.2

Means for "College-Wide Orientation"

Value	Number in Group	Mean
No (4)	80	98
Yes(1)	127	101

Table 11

Content of Responses to Open-Ended Questions on New Faculty Survey Based on Year of Arrival at M-DCC

Response	Group: 1985-86--1987-88 Number	Percent	1988-89-1989-90 Number	Percent	1990-91--1992-93 Number	Percent	Total Number	Percent
Item: During My First Year I Was Really Surprised....								
Administrative Support	5	18.5%	12	24.0%	28	29.2%	45	26.0%
Campus Climate	7	25.9%	4	8.0%	12	12.5%	23	13.3%
Interactions with Colleagues	6	22.2%	10	20.0%	11	11.5%	27	15.6%
Job Requirements	4	14.8%	7	14.0%	12	12.5%	23	13.3%
Students	3	11.1%	5	10.0%	21	21.9%	29	16.8%
Other	2	7.4%	12	24.0%	12	12.5%	26	15.0%
Total	27	100.0%	50	100.0%	96	100.0%	173	100.0%
Item: The Hardest Thing I Had To Do My First Year Was....								
Administrative Support	7	25.9%	6	13.3%	34	37.0%	47	28.7%
Campus Climate	3	11.1%	2	4.4%	5	5.4%	10	6.1%
Interactions with Colleagues	0	0.0%	1	2.2%	2	2.2%	3	1.8%
Job Requirements	16	59.3%	28	62.2%	46	50.0%	90	54.9%
Students	0	0.0%	1	2.2%	3	3.3%	4	2.4%
Other	1	3.7%	7	15.6%	2	2.2%	10	6.1%
Total	27	100.0%	45	100.0%	92	100.0%	164	100.0%
Item: It Helped A Lot When....								
Administrative Support	4	15.4%	6	14.0%	16	17.4%	26	16.1%
Campus Climate	3	11.5%	0	0.0%	1	1.1%	4	2.5%
Interactions with Colleagues	14	53.8%	23	53.5%	60	65.2%	97	60.2%
Job Requirements	5	19.2%	8	18.6%	5	5.4%	18	11.2%
Students	0	0.0%	2	4.7%	4	4.3%	6	3.7%
Other	0	0.0%	4	9.3%	6	6.5%	10	6.2%
Total	26	100.0%	43	100.0%	92	100.0%	161	100.0%
Item: I Wish I Had Known Then That....								
Administrative Support	11	64.7%	11	44.0%	18	47.4%	40	50.0%
Campus Climate	1	5.9%	2	8.0%	3	7.9%	6	7.5%
Interactions with Colleagues	0	0.0%	2	8.0%	2	5.3%	4	5.0%
Job Requirements	2	11.8%	4	16.0%	10	26.3%	16	20.0%
Students	1	5.9%	1	4.0%	1	2.6%	3	3.8%
Other	2	11.8%	5	20.0%	4	10.5%	11	13.8%
Total	17	100.0%	25	100.0%	38	100.0%	80	100.0%
Item: It Would Help New Faculty If The College Would....								
Administrative Support	15	71.4%	27	75.0%	59	84.3%	101	79.5%
Campus Climate	1	4.8%	1	2.8%	2	2.9%	4	3.1%
Interactions with Colleagues	0	0.0%	1	2.8%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%
Job Requirements	1	4.8%	6	16.7%	7	10.0%	14	11.0%
Students	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	1	0.8%
Other	4	19.0%	1	2.8%	1	1.4%	6	4.7%
Total	21	100.0%	36	100.0%	70	100.0%	127	100.0%

Institutional Research
Offices: 25 N.E. second street
Miami, FL [illegible]
[illegible]
FAX [illegible]

Appendix A

MIAMI-DADE
COMMUNITY COLLEGE
District Administration

February 12, 1993

Dear Faculty Member:

One of the earliest tasks of the Teaching/Learning Project was to study the problems that new faculty have when entering the Miami-Dade system. Several recommendations were made and implemented including college-wide and campus orientations and assigned mentors for new faculty. We are now attempting to see if these changes made any difference in the first-year experiences of new faculty and what further changes might be helpful.

You are being asked to respond to the following survey because, according to college records, you began your full-time employment at M-DCC either just prior to or just after these changes were implemented. You are part of a small and select group. We need each of you to respond in order to draw accurate conclusions. Please base your responses only on your **first-year experiences** at Miami-Dade.

Only group results will be presented as part of the evaluation. Your individual responses will remain anonymous. If you have questions, please contact Marcia Belcher (7-7488) or Jan Rich (7-7489).

Please take a moment NOW or within the next week to answer the survey and mail it back to the Office of Institutional Research, Room 5601, Bonnie McCabe Hall, Wolfson Campus. Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

Marcia J. Belcher
Associate Director

MJB:ab
enc.

40

AB93020

Mailing Address: 300 N.E. Second Avenue, Miami, FL [illegible]

Appendix A

Survey to Evaluate the New Faculty Component of the Teaching/Learning Project

The purpose of this survey is to elicit information from you on your recollections of your first year of employment as a faculty member at M-DCC. Please take a moment to think back to your first year as a full-time faculty member. Think about the courses you were teaching, the feelings and impressions you had that year, and then respond to the following questions.

Use the following options in responding to items 1-14:

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = neither agree nor disagree
4 = agree
5 = strongly agree
N/A = not applicable

Mark N/A if the item was not applicable to your situation.

____ 1. When I first walked into the classroom, I was surprised at the composition of the Miami-Dade student body.

____ 2. I had a good idea of what was expected of me when I took the job.

____ 3. I knew what Miami-Dade stood for when I started.

____ 4. I felt lonely at work my first year.

____ 5. My teaching load the first year was difficult to handle.

____ 6. I received the support I needed in order to carry out my teaching responsibilities.

____ 7. My colleagues received me warmly and helped me adjust.

____ 8. When I look back now on my first year, I don't see how I survived.

____ 9. I understood employee benefits and options.

____ 10. I quickly learned where to go when I needed help.

____ 11. The paperwork and forms overwhelmed me.

____ 12. My mentor helped me.

____ 13. My first year schedule of classes was worse than those of more established colleagues.

____ 14. Overall, I would judge my first year of teaching a success.

Please respond to the following items by completing the sentences.

During my first year, I was really surprised.....

The hardest thing I had to do my first year was....

It helped a lot when....

I wish I had known then that.... Appendix A

It would help new faculty if the college would....

The following are ways of orienting and supporting new faculty. Please check all activities that you received or participated in.

___ District-wide orientation for new faculty
___ Campus-level orientation for new faculty
___ Follow-up orientation meetings
___ Assigned mentor
___ Other (_____)

Please provide the following information on yourself.

When did you begin as a full-time faculty member for M-DCC? 19____

On which M-DCC campus did you begin your full-time teaching career?
___ North
___ Kendall
___ Wolfson/InterAmerican
___ Medical
___ Homestead

Did you work for M-DCC before you began your full-time faculty position?
___ Yes
___ No

Approximately how many years of teaching experience did you have before coming to M-DCC?
_____ years

Where did you gain most of your prior teaching experience?
___ K-12 system
___ Community College system
___ University system
___ Other _____
___ No prior experience

How many preparations did you have your first term as a full-time faculty member?
___ One
___ Two
___ Three
___ Four or more

Did you have any overloads your first year?
___ Yes
___ No

Other Comments:

MAIL TO: Institutional Research, 5601 Bonnie McCabe Hall, Wolfson Campus
DEADLINE: March 1, 1993

MJB:ab
2/3/93

Appendix B

MIAMI-DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION - BONNIE McCABE HALL

March 1, 1993

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Hired between 1985-92

FROM: Marcia J. Belcher

SUBJECT: **Return of New Faculty Surveys**

Several weeks ago I sent you a survey on your first year experiences at Miami-Dade. As far as I know, I have not yet received yours back. Your response is needed to help decide answers to questions such as:

Are we placing too big a burden on our faculty members their first year?

In what areas can we improve the experiences of first-year faculty?

Have some of the programs put in place for new faculty (e.g., mentors, orientation) made any difference in their first-year experiences?

I need each of you to respond so I can ensure that the findings are reflective of the whole group and not just a few members who take the time to respond.

If you are hesitating over responding because of the number on your survey, let me assure you that no one but me has the link between the survey number and your results and I will destroy it as soon as the surveys are returned. I thought the number was necessary for two reasons. (1) I need a high response rate to ensure accurate results. The best way to get a high response rate is to follow-up and ask individuals to respond. (2) Some people skipped the second side of the survey. By knowing the number I know which year employment was begun so I can add this information and not have to discard the survey.

Perhaps I misjudged the level of mistrust prevalent at the institution. I truly do not see how anyone else will know your results except me. If you cannot trust me, just rip the number off and return the survey making sure you've completed BOTH sides. Then when I follow up, just say you've already sent it.

If you have not yet responded, please do so now. I have enclosed another copy of the survey. If you already have sent yours back, thanks. Each of you will receive a copy of the full study when it is completed.

MJB:rmz

Enclosure

RETURN SURVEYS TO 5601 BONNIE MCCABE HALL, WOLFSON CAMPUS.

RZ93-454

Miami-Dade Community College

MIAMI-DADE IS AN EQUAL ACCESS/EQUAL OPPORTUNITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
AND DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE ON THE BASIS OF HANDICAP. 4/88